Convention on Cluster Munitions

9 July 2018

Original: English

Eighth Meeting of States Parties
Geneva, 3 - 5 September 2018
Item 7 of the provisional agenda
Review of the status and operation of the Convention and other matters important for achieving the aims of the Convention

Convention on Cluster Munitions Eighth Meeting of States Parties (8MSP) Progress Report — monitoring progress in implementing the Dubrovnik Action Plan

Submitted by the President of the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

I. Introduction

1. This report presents an aggregate analysis of trends and figures in the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) as operationalized in the Dubrovnik Action Plan (DAP) which will guide the work of the CCM from the First Review Conference (1RC) in 2015 to the Second Review Conference scheduled for 2020. This report specifically focuses on the progress made between 1 July 2017 and 30 June 2018 which includes advancements made in the period just before and after the 7th Meeting of States Parties held in September 2017.

2. The report has been structured to provide a document that is as practical and useful as possible on the global implementation of the CCM. It is further intended to guide discussions at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties (8MSP) by monitoring progress and identifying key issues and/or challenges to be addressed. The lists of questions/challenges identified are not intended to be exhaustive but rather indicative. The key elements under each thematic area have been summarized to provide an overall status of implementation of the Convention at a glance. It does not in any way replace the requirement for formal reporting nor does it seek to provide a complete overview of all the progress made in implementing the 32 Action Points contained in the Dubrovnik Action Plan. The information contained in this report is based on publicly available information, including from official statements and States Parties' initial and annual transparency reports due annually on 30 April.

II. Report Summary

Universalization

(a) Two new States Parties brings total to 103;

(b) Seventeen Signatory States still to ratify the Convention eight years after its entry into force;

(c) Twenty seven more States Parties needed to meet 2020 target of 130 States Parties;

(d) Steady increase recorded in support of the CCM since the first CCM UNGA resolution was adopted in December 2015.

Stockpile Destruction

(a) One State Party completed destruction of stockpiles ahead of its deadline leaving nine still with Article 3 obligations;

(b) Since entry into force of the CCM, 30 out of 40 States Parties have completed destruction of their stockpiles;

(c) Two States Parties with deadlines on 1 August 2018 reported that they would comply with their obligation on time;

(d) Eight out of 10 States Parties provided information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction; of the remaining two, one is yet to submit its initial transparency report;

(e) One State Party announced that it had destroyed all of its retained stockpiles while 11 States reported to have continued retaining cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by Article 3.6 of the Convention;

(f) One State Party reported for the first time to have retained cluster munitions for the purposes permitted under Article 3;

(g) All 11 States Parties provided an update on the planned and actual use of the retained submunitions in accordance with Article 3.8, an increase in the level of reporting compared to only five States Parties in the previous reporting period.

Clearance and Risk Reduction Education

(a) One State Party informed that it would complete clearance of all its cluster contaminated areas well ahead of its stipulated 2022 deadline;

(b) One State Party reported that with adequate financial, material and in-kind support it would be able to fulfil its Article 4 obligations before its 2020 deadline;

(c) Nine out of 10 States Parties with Article 4 obligations provided updated information concerning the location, scope and extent of cluster munition contamination and/or on the status and progress of programmes for the clearance for cluster munitions remnants in areas under their jurisdiction and control;

(d) One State Party reported on the discovery of new contaminated areas.

Victim Assistance

(a) Nine out of 11 States Parties with Article 5 obligations reported on the designation or existence of a national focal point;

(b) Seven out of 11 States Parties with Article 5 obligations provided information on national laws or national action plans relating to victims/persons with disabilities;

(c) Three States Parties reported on new cluster munition victims;

(d) Six States Parties reported to have integrated their victim assistance (VA) efforts into the broader disability sector;

(e) Seven States Parties reported having involved victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes;

(f) Seven States Parties requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance.

International Cooperation and Assistance

(a) Twelve States Parties requested international cooperation and assistance through their 2017 Article 7 report;

(b) Twenty one States Parties reported through their 2017 Article 7 report that they provided assistance to affected States, an increase of four from the previous period;

(c) Eleven States Parties reported to have received assistance in their 2017 Article 7 report;

(d) Three informal meetings were hosted by the Coordinators, with States Parties with potential needs for assistance in fulfilling Convention obligations and States Parties with capacity to provide that assistance, to facilitate communication between these groups of States Parties a and to encourage the formation of partnerships;

(e) One new Country Coalition partnership, one existing partnership, and one potential partnership were discussed at the informal meetings hosted by the Coordinators.

Transparency Measures

(a) Eighty one States Parties out of the expected 102 have submitted their initial transparency reports;

(b) Thirteen States Parties still to submit overdue initial transparency report; a reduction of 40%;

(c) Nine States Parties submitted their initial transparency reports in the reporting period; a 100% increase from the submission rate during the previous reporting period;

(d) Fifty eight States Parties out of the expected 101 submitted their 2017 Annual Report with 25 reports still outstanding;

(e) Two new States Parties missed its deadline for the submission of its initial report

National Implementation Measures

(a) One State Party reported it had enacted specific legislation cluster munitions;

(b) Five States Parties in initial/annual transparency reported on having sufficient existing legislation in place;

(c) Seven States Parties reported to have legislation under consideration or in the process of being adopted;

III. CCM 8MSP Progress Report for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

A. Universalization

Table 1

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan. Actions 1.1 to 1.3	*During reporting period*
An increased number of States Parties to the Convention (130 at least)	Increase adherence with the Convention	Two new States Parties —— one ratification and one accession
A decreased number of reported alleged and confirmed instances of use		17 Signatory States still to ratify
		27 still to go to reach the DAP 2020 objective of 130 States Parties
		Slight positive improvement in universalization rate
	Promote the universalization	Numerous bilateral meetings with representatives of Signatory States and States not Party
		Letters sent to encourage States to ratify/accede to the Convention
		One seminar for Signatory States on ratification of the Convention
	Reinforce the norms being established by the Convention	Slight increase in support of UNGA Resolution on the implementation of the CCM

1. **Questions/challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties**

(a) How can stakeholders of the Convention make use of identified internal and external factors to motivate States to join?

(b) What level of certainty regarding available evidence on use of cluster munitions would States require in order to speak out against all use, production and/or transfer of cluster munitions?

(c) How can regional and international cooperation and assistance be used and promoted to increase the membership of the CCM?

2. **Progress report on universalization: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan**

3. During the period under review, the universalization rate improved slightly with two new States Parties — one by ratification (signatory State, Benin) and the other through accession (State not party, Sri Lanka). In accordance with Article 17 (2), the Convention entered into force for Benin on 1st January 2018. Sri Lanka acceded to the Convention on 1st March 2018 and the Convention will enter into force for it on 1st September 2018. As of 30 June 2018, a total of 120 States had joined the CCM by signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention. Of these, 103 are States Parties whilst 17 are Signatory States.

4. Since the time the Convention entered into force close to eight years ago, 17 Signatory States still have to ratify it. These States are Angola, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cyprus, Djibouti, Gambia, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Namibia, Nigeria, Philippines, Sao Tomé and Principe, Tanzania and Uganda.

5. Action 1.1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan requires that another 27 States join the CCM in order to achieve the objective of 130 States Parties by the Second Review Conference in 2020. Even though 73 Member States of the United Nations are neither Signatories nor Parties to the Convention, in December 2017, 142 Member States of the United Nations voted in favour of United Nations General Assembly resolution 72/54 "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions", showing a steady increase in support of the CCM since the first United Nations General Assembly resolution on the Convention on Cluster Munitions was adopted in December 2015.

6. Action 1 of the Dubrovnik Action Plan aims to increase adherence with the Convention, promote its universalization and reinforce the norms being established by the Convention. In this regard, the Coordinators on Universalization met with representatives of Signatory States and States not Party in the margins of various non-CCM meetings including the intersessional meetings of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention held in Geneva from 7 to 8 June 2018 to implement the strategy outlined in their Action plan for the period under review.

7 Additionally, the Coordinators sent out letters to the 17 Signatory States requesting an update on efforts being made to ratify the CCM. The Coordinators also held bilateral meetings with the representatives of four Signatory States; Haiti, Indonesia, Central African Republic and Tanzania to obtain additional information on the obstacles and challenges faced by States in the process of ratification. The meetings allowed Coordinators to reiterate their availability to provide support to these States in the ratification process and to conduct demarches in their respective capitals.

8. Furthermore, the Coordinators sent demarches to States not Party and held bilateral meetings with others such as Cambodia to promote the universalization of the Convention.

9. In support of the work of the Coordinators, the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) followed-up with States not Party to the CCM from the Pacific region including the Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu. These countries were provided with the necessary informative materials and toolkit on the accession process.

10. In collaboration with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), the Coordinators on Universalization and the ISU participated in an informal meeting of the First Committee in

the margin of the 138th Assembly of the IPU on 27th March, 2018. The ISU made a general presentation on the Convention at the meeting with an aim to have the CCM included on the agenda of Parliamentarians in their respective countries. This would ideally raise awareness of the Convention and facilitate speedy ratification of or accession to the Convention. The meeting was attended by Parliamentarians from both Signatories States and from States not Party.

11. With the support of the ISU, the Coordinators on Universalization convened an informal meeting on 23rd May 2018, with the Geneva representatives of Namibia, Nigeria, Tanzania and The Philippines. Signatory States attending the event provided updates on their ratification processes and other plans regarding the ratification of the Convention. The meeting provided an opportunity for the exchange of experiences on how best to overcome the identified obstacles and challenges in the ratification process.

B. Stockpile destruction and retention

Table 2

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 2.1 to 2.5	*During reporting period*
An increased number of States Parties that finished stockpile destruction Increased levels of reporting on matters pertaining to Article 3 implementation, including information on the amount and planned use of sub-munitions retained Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Develop a resourced plan	Seven States Parties with destruction plan in place or being developed Two States Parties reported that they had received technical assistance from an international clearance organization to assess needs, develop and implement a destruction plan Six States Parties apply standards related to safety and environment Eight States Parties updated information on the status and progress of their stockpile destruction Four States Parties updated information on expected completion date of destruction Two States Parties reported allocation of national resources to stockpile destruction
	Increase exchanges of promising practices	Two States Parties reported to have received technical assistance from an international mine

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 2.1 to 2.5	*During reporting period*
		action organization
	Apply an appropriate approach to retention	13 States Parties retained cluster munitions as provided for in the CCM
		One State Party reported destruction of all retained stockpiles
		11 States Parties provided updates on the use of retained submunitions
		Five States Parties reported on the use of retained cluster munitions through trainings
		One State Party declared that it would not retain any stockpiles while 1 reported for the first time to have retained cluster munitions for permitted purposes
	Announce declaration of compliance on stockpile destruction	One State Party reported completion of Stockpile Destruction
	Act upon unexpected developments	One State Party clarified completion of destruction of stockpiled submunitions owned by another State Party

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

(a) How can cooperation and assistance be effectively facilitated between States Parties with Article 3 obligations and international organizations with stockpile destruction expertise/capacities?

(b) How can States Parties with pending Article 3 obligations effectively express their need or assistance and ensure that they have explored all existing avenues for receiving financial resources/technical expertise and in a timely manner?

(c) How can States with obligations ensure that adequate political will and national ownership exist from the beginning as a key prerequisite for successful implementation of obligations?

(d) How can States Parties with Article 3 obligations be more proactive in pursuing regional cooperation approaches to address their needs?

2. Progress report on Stockpile Destruction: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

12. Since entry into force of the CCM, a total of 40 States Parties reported to have had obligations under Article 3. Of these, 30 have since declared completion of their stockpile destruction. 14 of the 40 States Parties reported to destroyed all of their stocks before entry into force of the Convention: Afghanistan, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Congo, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Republic of Moldova, Norway, Portugal and Sierra Leone.

13. According to information provided through 2017 Article 7 reports and other official statements by States Parties, there remain nine States Parties with obligations under Article 3 (Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain and Switzerland).

14. Of these nine States Parties, seven (Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Peru, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland) submitted their 2017 annual reports with updated information on Article 3 implementation; while one (South Africa) had an overdue 2017 annual report; and one State Party (Guinea-Bissau) has still not submitted its initial transparency report.

15. During the period under review, one State Party (Cuba), which had stockpile destruction obligations, reported to have complied with its Article 3 obligations.

16. Of the seven States Parties that submitted their 2017 annual report, four (Botswana, Croatia, Spain and Switzerland) provided updated information on the expected completion date of stockpile destruction. Two States Parties, Croatia and Spain, with a stockpile destruction deadlines on 1 August 2018 and 1 State Party, Botswana, with the deadline on 1 December 2019, informed that they would comply with their obligations within the stipulated timeframe. One State Party, Switzerland, with stockpile destruction deadline on 1 January 2021 reported that it would finalize the disposal of its stockpile by the end of 2018, two years ahead of its Article 3 deadline. One State Party, Bulgaria, made no progress in the destruction of its stockpiles since the last reporting period.

17. In line with Action 2.1 of the DAP, among States Parties with remaining stockpile destruction obligations, seven States Parties (Botswana, Bulgaria, Croatia, Peru, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland) have reported that a destruction plan is in place and/or being developed;

18. Two States Parties (Cuba and Slovakia) reported having allocated national resources to their national programmes to comply with Article 3 obligations.

19. Two States Parties (Botswana and Peru) reported that they had received technical assistance from an international clearance organization to assess needs, develop and implement a destruction plan.

20. Five States Parties (Botswana, Croatia, Slovakia, Spain and Switzerland) reported that they will ensure that destruction techniques are in compliance with national and international standards in terms of safety and protection of the environment.

21. One State Party (Bulgaria) reported that it had destroyed stockpiled submunitions owned by another State Party, Slovenia, thus ensuring its compliance with Article 3.

22. 11 States Parties (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland) reported in their 2017 annual report that they continue to retain cluster munitions and explosive sub-munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention.

23. One State Party (Bulgaria) reported for the first time to have retained cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention.

24. One State Party (Cameroon) that had previously declared having retained cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention still has to submit its 2017 annual report and provide an update on the current and planned use of retained cluster munitions.

25. One State Party (Italy) announced that it had destroyed all of its retained stockpiles.

26. One State Party with Article 3 obligations (Cuba) specifically mentioned that it would not retain any stockpiles for authorized purposes under Article 3.6.

27. All 11 States Parties (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Spain, Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland) that had previously declared retaining cluster munitions for the purposes permitted by the Convention, provided an update on the planned and actual use of these retained submunitions in accordance with Article 3.8. This represented an increase in the level of reporting compared to the previous period where only 5 States Parties had reported on the use of retained stocks.

28. Of the 11, five States Parties (Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany and Spain) reported on the use of retained cluster munitions through trainings conducted which lead to a significant decrease in numbers while five States (Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland) did not report any decrease in their retained stocks. However, three of these (Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland) did clarify that they would reduce numbers of retained munitions in the future.

29. During the reporting period, the Coordinators on Stockpile Destruction and Retention held bilateral meetings with a number of States Parties, in which these States were reminded of their obligations under Article 3 of the Convention and encouraged to provide an update on the progress made towards the implementation of their commitments. Additionally, the Coordinators sent out letters to four States Parties (Italy, Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark) with retained munitions permitted under Article 3, requesting them to provide updated information on these munitions. Only one State Party (Italy) replied announcing the destruction of all its retained stocks.

C. Clearance and Risk Reduction Education

Table 3

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 3.1 to 3.8	*During reporting period*
A decreased number of new victims, with the aim of zero Increased amounts of suspected land released for subsistence, cultural, social and commercial purposes Better targeting of scarce clearance resources Larger freedom and safer movement Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Assess the extent of the problem	Nine States Parties reported on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition contamination
	(a) Affected States Parties subject to obligations under Article 4 will endeavour to make every effort to promote clarity on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition remnants in areas under its jurisdiction or control, drawing on survey approaches (technical and non-technical) as appropriate and needed.	One State Party reported on newly contaminated areas
	Protect people from harm	Seven States Parties with Article 4 obligations reported to have provided risk reduction education and/or marked/fenced hazardous areas.
	Develop a resourced plan (a) Affected States Parties will	Five States Parties with Article 4 obligations

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 3.1 to 3.8	*During reporting period*
	endeavour to develop and start the implementation of Article 4 compliant national clearance strategies and plans based on survey results and clearance rates, taking into account best practices, international and national standards and methods	reported to have allocated national resources to clearance. Nine States Parties reported on the status of progress of clearance programmes.
	Be inclusive when developing the response	No State provided specific information on the inclusion of communities in the development of clearance plans
	Manage information for analysis, decision-making and reporting	No State reported specifically on land release through methods other than clearance.
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	One workshop held in affected region to support Article 4 implementation
	Apply practice development	Discussions held with affected States and clearance operators on effective clearance methodologies Clearance Coordinators contributed to the development of the Guidelines for Extension Requests
	Promote and expand cooperation	Clearance Coordinators participated in two closed side-events organized by Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

(a) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support the efforts of affected States develop and implement cost-efficient survey and land-release plans of affected areas?

(b) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States with a relatively manageable contamination to finish their Article 4 obligations by their respective deadlines in order to avoid a request for extension?

(c) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support the efforts of affected States develop and implement risk reduction education programmes?

(d) How can States Parties and other implementation actors best support affected States in balancing the assistance between survey, clearance and risk reduction education?

(e) How can States Parties and other implementation actors assist in mobilizing sufficient funds to support affected states in order to meet the Convention's obligations?

2. Progress report on Clearance and Risk Reduction Education: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

30. To meet the DAP's goals, Lao People's Democratic Republic and the Netherlands, in their capacity as Coordinators for Clearance and Risk Reduction Education, undertook a number of activities during the period under review.

31. Under the previous Coordinators, Norway and the Netherlands, a plan was developed to hold a regional workshop in the Balkans with regard to Action 3.8, on promoting and expanding cooperation. The workshop took place during the current reporting period, from 8 to 10 November 2017. The workshop, which took place in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina was facilitated by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). Mine Action operators The HALO Trust and Norwegian People's Aid contributed to the workshop. The Director of the ISU of the Convention and a representative from UNDP were present, as well as representatives from Norway and the Netherlands. The workshop focused on cluster munition survey and clearance and, in particular, the development of plans to complete clearance. Best practice and lessons learnt on survey and clearance were addressed and information was shared between participants concerning their respective national plans on survey and clearance.

32. On the basis of their Concept Note, the Coordinators identified countries where follow-up was needed regarding their Article 4 obligations. For three countries, a clarification was required regarding their clearance plans. The Coordinators followed-up on this via letters and bilateral meetings. The aim was to limit, where realistic, the number of potential extension requests.

33. 10 States Parties have reported to be contaminated by cluster munition remnants and therefore had obligations under Article 4 during the reporting period: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

34. Nine out of the 10 States Parties with Article 4 obligations (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro) have submitted their 2017 annual report with information on Article 4 implementation.

35. One State Party with Article 4 obligations (Chile) still had not submitted its 2017 annual transparency report.

36. All 9 States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Germany, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro) in their 2017 annual reports provided information on the location, scope and extent of cluster munition contamination and/or on the status and progress of programmes for the clearance for cluster munitions remnants on their national territory.

37. During the period under review none of the States Parties with clearance obligations announced compliance with their obligations under Article 4.

38. One State Party (Afghanistan) informed that it would complete clearance of all its cluster contaminated areas well ahead of its Convention stipulated deadline of 1 March 2022.

39. One State Party (Montenegro) also reported that, depending on financial, material and in-kind support provided, it would be able to fulfil its Article 4 obligations before its stipulated deadline of 1 August 2020.

40. One State Party, Iraq, informed that progress was largely dependent on security.

41. One State Party (Lebanon) reported on the discovery of new contaminated areas.

42. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro) reported on their challenges

and/or on international assistance and cooperation needed to fulfil obligations under Article 4 through their Article 7 report.

43. Five States Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon) with Article 4 obligations reported to have allocated national resources to clearance operations.

44. Eight States reported to have received assistance; Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro.

45. Seven States Parties with Article 4 obligations (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Germany) reported to have taken measures to provide risk reduction education and/or to prevent civilian access to areas contaminated by cluster munitions remnants through marking and fencing.

46. One State Party (Montenegro) informed that it would plan to undertake risk reduction education activities and requested assistance in that regard.

47. The Coordinators on Clearance and Risk Reduction Education contributed to the development of the draft *Guidelines for Article 3 and Article 4 Extension Requests* being developed by the Coordinators on the General Status and Operation of the Convention. The Committee also held bilateral meetings with Lao People's Democratic Republic and Germany whose clearance deadlines are due in 2020 to explain and discuss the procedure.

48. With regard to Action 3.8, on promoting and expanding cooperation, the Coordinators also participated in cross-cutting activities with the Coordinators on International Cooperation and Assistance in order to enhance cooperation between affected and donor States.

D. Victim Assistance

Table 4

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 4.1 to 4.4	*During reporting period*
An improvement in the quality and quantity of assistance provided to persons with disabilities Strengthened respect for human rights to all persons Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective practices Increased involvement of victims in consultations and policy-making and decisions making processes on issues that concern them Increased cooperation assistance for victim assistance programmes, through traditional mechanisms, and south-south, regional and triangular cooperation and in linking	Strengthen national capacity (a) Designating a focal point within the government to coordinate victim assistance (b) Develop a national disability action plan or develop a national action plan on victim assistance	**(a) the end of 2016** Nine States Parties with designated national focal point **(b) the end of 2018** Six States Parties with a national plan to address Victim Assistance One State Party reported on efforts to implement the national law on disability One State Party reported a National Disability Strategy will be adopted by the end of 2018 Two States Parties reported on national resources allocated to VA activities One State Party reported that

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik Action Plan Actions 4.1 to 4.4	*During reporting period*
national focal points and centres		a comprehensive law on disabilities and National Action Plan were awaiting approval
Increased demonstration of results achieved and/or expected results in Article 7 transparency report		Six States Parties reported that victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector
	Increase the involvement of victims	Seven States Parties reported involving victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes on victim assistance
	Share information	Nine of 11 States Parties with Article 5 obligations submitted their Article 7 transparency report
		Three States Parties reported on new cluster munition victims
		Four States Parties provided disaggregated victim data
		Two States Parties reported on data collection and surveying activities
		One State Party highlighted challenges with regards to data collection
		Three States Parties provided detailed feedback on key challenges and priorities regarding Article 5 implementation
	Provide support, assist and cooperate	Eight States Parties requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance
		Seven States Parties reported on international assistance and cooperation received for victim assistance

1. **Questions for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties**

(a) What obstacles prevent States from designating national focal points on *victim assistance?*

(b) What obstacles prevent States from developing national disability action plans and national action plans on victim assistance?

(c) What mechanisms help increase involvement of victims in policy and decision-making processes on issues that concern them?

(d) How can information exchange support Article 5 implementation?

(e) What good practices can ensure the sustainability and effective targeting of cooperation and assistance on victim assistance?

2. Progress report on Victim Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

49. To date, 11 States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro and Sierra Leone) have reported to have cluster munition victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control, giving rise to obligations under Article 5 of the Convention.

50. The Coordinators on Victim Assistance noted from Article 7 reports submitted for 2017 that, of 11 States Parties with victim assistance obligations, nine (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro) submitted their Article 7 transparency report; one State Party (Sierra Leone) missed the due date for submission of its 2017 annual report and one State Party (Guinea-Bissau) still had not submitted its initial transparency report which was due in 2011.

51. Three States Parties (Lao People's Democratic Republic, Iraq and Lebanon) reported on new cluster munitions victims during the period under review. Four States Parties, (Afghanistan, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon) provided disaggregated data on victims. One State Party (Croatia) explained that it was in the process of finalizing a victim database with the aim to develop further and strengthen policy actions for victims. One State Party (Lao People's Democratic Republic) informed that it had completed a national survey of UXO victims that will help define policies and needs. One State Party (Bosnia and Herzegovina) highlighted challenges with regards to data collection.

52. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq and Lao People's Democratic Republic) reported that their victim assistance efforts were integrated into the broader disability sector. One State Party (Lebanon) reported on efforts made to implement its existing law on disabilities. One State Party (Afghanistan) reported that it would finalize and adopt a National Disability Strategy before the end of 2018. One State Party (Chad) reported that it had developed a comprehensive law for people with disabilities but that it still needed to be approved.

53. One State Party (Montenegro) informed that it does not have a national victim assistance plan in place. One State Party (Chad) reported that it has developed a national victim assistance Plan but that it still needs to be approved. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iraq and Lebanon) reported on their national plan to address victim assistance. One State Party, Croatia, reported on national resources allocated to the implementation of victim assistance activities.

54. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lebanon, Croatia, Iraq and Lao People's Democratic Republic) reported on involving victims and/or people with disabilities in decision making processes on victim assistance.

55. One State Party (Afghanistan) reported that it had noticed a drop in funding towards victim assistance leading to a reduction of activities. Eight States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro) requested international assistance and cooperation specifically for victim assistance. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon) reported on international assistance and cooperation received for victim assistance. Six States Parties (Afghanistan, Albania, Chad, Croatia, Lebanon and Iraq) informed that they had made efforts to mobilize national and international resources for victim assistance.

56. During the review period, the Coordinators on Victim Assistance focused on the implementation of Action 4.1 of the DAP outlining two specific, time-bound commitments aimed at strengthening the national capacity of States Parties with obligations under Article 5 of the Convention.

57. With the assistance of the ISU, the Coordinators identified two States Parties with obligations under Article 5 (Guinea Bissau and Sierra Leone) yet to inform of the designation of a victim assistance focal point by the end of 2016, as mandated in Action 4.1, para. 32(a) of the DAP. In January 2018, the Coordinators wrote to these States Parties reminding them of their commitment under the DAP to designate a victim assistance focal point by the end of 2016, and requesting an update on progress towards its implementation. The Coordinators did not receive a response from either of these States.

58. Under Action 4.1 in para 32(c), States Parties with cluster munitions victims in areas under their jurisdiction or control commit to develop a national disability action plan as soon as possible, or develop a national action plan on victim assistance, by no later than the end of 2018. The Coordinators did not receive any response from either of these States. During an informal meeting organized by the Coordinators on Article 6 of the Convention in November 2017 on *Enhancing International Cooperation and Assistance*, Montenegro reported on the need for international and expert assistance in its efforts to strengthen relevant legislative and administrative frameworks, including for the establishment of a national action plan on victim assistance.

59. As in 2017, the Coordinators also focused on facilitating increased information exchange among States Parties on the implementation of Article 5 obligations, with the goal of identifying good practices as possible useful resources for other States Parties, and providing a platform to share information on challenges and to convey assistance needs. In early 2018, they wrote to Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Lebanon, inviting them to share information regarding the challenges and key priorities encountered in implementing Article 5 obligations. By 30 June 2018, one State Party, Lebanon, had provided the Coordinators with a copy of the national transparency report for 2017 in reply to this information request. In the report, Lebanon highlights its assistance needs on victim assistance — relating to the provision of medical, rehabilitation, and socio-economic support to victims — and underlines that victim assistance is one of the most expensive components of mine action in the country, which needs continuous investment and mobilization of resources that are not secured.

60. The Article 5 Coordinators met informally with representatives of 2 of these States Parties in the margins of the National Mine Action Directors Meeting held in February 2017, and were able to identify some common challenges to Article 5 implementation. These included difficulties with:

(a) Completing victims surveys, due to insufficient resources and/or inaccessibility of parts of the territory (security conditions, remote areas);

(b) Data disaggregation by age and gender;

(c) Lacking medical structures (for emergency treatment and/or long-term rehabilitation) in some regions;

(d) Insufficient or low quality medical equipment and materials;

(e) Inadequate resources to provide socio-economic support (vocational training, income generation for direct and indirect victims);

(f) Coordination at the central level among different relevant ministries/agencies; vertical cooperation across different layers of governance/policy making (national, regional, local); horizontal cooperation among federal/regional/local authorities in harmonizing data collection, provision of services and inclusion policies.

61. The experience reported by these two States Parties, in addition to the information provided by Lebanon, confirmed the general observation that it is very difficult to secure long term financial and other resources for victim assistance, especially with regards to rehabilitation, psychological, social and economic support. Generally speaking, in the framework of the CCM and other related Conventions, the amount of international

assistance dedicated to victim assistance falls far short of recipients' needs and represents a very small percentage of total mine action funding.

62. The Coordinators concluded that this exercise was extremely useful. At the same time, they would like to stress the cooperative nature of this process, whose aim is not to verify compliance with the Convention or the DAP, but to facilitate the sharing of lessons learnt and challenges encountered in victim assistance efforts. The success of this exercise will depend on the willingness of affected States to engage in a constructive exchange with the Coordinators that is less formalized than the national reporting mechanism provided in Article 7 of the Convention, with a view to increasing States Parties' and potential donors' awareness of the specific needs of States with victim assistance obligations, and identifying good practices helpful for all States with Article 5 obligations.

63. In building on previous efforts, the Coordinators also continued to work to improve coordination on issues of victim assistance with other disarmament conventions including regarding commitments on victim assistance. On 22 February 2018, the Coordinators participated in a victim assistance retreat organized by the Committee on Victim Assistance of the APMBC, which was also attended by the Victim Assistance Coordinators of Protocol V of the CCW, and the Committees on the Enhancement of Cooperation and Assistance of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The retreat provided an opportunity to share plans and objectives for 2018, discuss respective priorities and identify possible opportunities for cooperation, with a view to promoting concerted and synergistic approaches to victim assistance. Participants agreed to pursue discussions in this regard. The idea of a "Victim Assistance focused" individualized approach was also discussed to be implemented in the coming months through a pilot side event.

64. Finally, the Coordinators promoted the Guidelines on Gender and Diversity-Responsive Victim Assistance in Mine Action, produced by the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP) in collaboration with Humanity and Inclusion (HI), with the financial support of Italy, at a side event organized during the Intersessional Meeting of the APMBC. The Guidelines are available at the address http://.gmap.ch/3098/.

E. International Cooperation and Assistance

Table 5

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik action plan actions 5.1 to 5.7	*During reporting period*
A decrease in the number of new victims and a better quality of life for victims	Strengthen partnerships at all levels	One new partnership formed
An increased number of States Parties that finish stockpile destruction in advance of their eight-year deadlines		One potential partnership discussed
A better targeting of scarce resources	Communicate challenges and seek assistance	12 Parties requested assistance
Increased technical and material assistance, transfer of skills and good practices		21 States Parties reported on provision of assistance to affected States
Increased and improved reporting on challenges and needs for assistance		12 affected States Parties reported assistance received from other States Parties and stakeholders
An increase of multi-year partnerships for cooperation including multi-year funding arrangements	Evidence based needs for better results	Six States Parties submitted requests for assistance based on surveys, needs assessments and analysis
An increase in the exchange of information of good and cost effective clearance and stockpile destruction practices including on safety, environmental impact and efficiency	Take ownership	Nine States Parties reported allocating national resources to implement the CCM
An increase in cooperation and assistance for victim assistance programming, with the aim to ensure that victims can participate in all aspects of life on an equal basis	Respond constructively to request for assistance	Two States Parties have assistance arrangements with an operator in response to requests made
		No States Parties reported provision of assistance to affected States based on specific requests
	Make use of existing tools, cost efficiency and effectiveness	33 States reported either requesting or providing assistance
	Support implementation support	54 States Parties paid contributions towards the ISU 2017 budget

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

(a) What are the key ways in which States Parties can provide cooperation and assistance under the Convention, whether they are affected or donor States?

(b) What can be done to enhance the implementation of partnerships under the Convention, including Country Coalitions?

(c) How can the sharing of information on needs and capacity to provide assistance under the Convention be enhanced, including through Article 7 reporting?

2. Progress report on International Cooperation and Assistance: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

65. 12 States Parties requested specific assistance in their annual or initial transparency report for 2017 (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, Nauru, the State of Palestine and Palau). This is the same number as in 2016.

66. Six States Parties specifically requested assistance to fulfil obligations under Article 4 through their 2017 annual transparency report (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro). Two States Parties with no obligations under Article 4 (Palau and State of Palestine) requested support to carry out UXO surveys. One State Party, Chad, requested support to define the real scope of cluster munition remnants contamination.

67. Through their 2017 annual transparency report, five States Parties specifically requested assistance to provide risk reduction education (Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, State of Palestine and Palau).

68. Eight States Parties specifically requested assistance to fulfil obligations under Article 5 through their 2017 annual transparency report (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon and Montenegro).

69. One State Party, Nauru, in its initial transparency report, specifically requested assistance in the development of specific national legislation on the implementation of the CCM, as stipulated under Article 9 of the Convention.

70. Contrastingly, 21 States Parties reported to have provided assistance to affected States (Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). This was an increase from 16 in 2016. Specifically, 17 of the donor States reported that they had provided support for clearance activities, 16 reported providing support to victim assistance, and 13 reported giving support to risk reduction education.

71. 12 States Parties reported to have received assistance from other States Parties and/or stakeholder organisations (Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Chad, Croatia, Iraq, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Montenegro, the State of Palestine and Palau).

72. Two States Parties with upcoming Article 3 deadlines reported on specific assistance received by an international clearance organization.

73. Nine States Parties with obligations under the Convention reported having allocated national resources to fulfil these obligations: Albania, Botswana, Croatia, Cuba, Germany, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Palau and the State of Palestine. This was a decrease in the reported numbers from 14 in 2016.

74. The Coordinators continue to encourage all States Parties with needs for assistance in fulfilling Convention obligations to provide their Article 7 reports in a timely manner and to report in as much detail as possible on their needs and challenges with regard to the fulfilment of their obligations. Article 7 reports continue to be a critical resource used by the Coordinators to bring States Parties with needs together with potential States Parties and civil society partners who may be able to help meet those needs.

75. During the period reported on, consistent with the Dubrovnik Action Plan, the Coordinators focused on enhancing communication between States Parties on their challenges, needs and their capacity to provide assistance to address these (Action 5.2), and facilitating the formation of partnerships between States Parties to meet pressing obligations under the Convention (Action 5.1), including through the Country Coalitions initiative of the Presidency of the Seventh Meeting of States Parties (7MSP).

76. The Coordinators continued supporting these priorities by holding closed informal meetings with States Parties with potential needs for assistance in fulfilling Convention obligations and States Parties with capacity to provide that assistance, to facilitate communication between these groups of States Parties and to encourage the formation of partnerships. Three such meetings were held: on 24 November in the margins of the 2017 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons Meeting of High Contracting Parties; on 20 December in the margins of the 2017 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention Meeting of States Parties; and on 8 June in the margins of the 2018 Intersessional Meetings of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

77. The primary objectives of the meetings were:

(a) To serve as an additional channel through which unmet needs and challenges could be raised by States Parties with needs under the CCM, for consideration by States Parties with the capacity to assist in addressing such needs and overcoming such challenges;

(b) To help States Parties with needs under the CCM understand how they could access assistance more effectively, by hearing from donor/partner States about their priorities and procedures for provision of assistance;

(c) To help donor States understand what difficulties affected States faced in accessing assistance;

(d) To provide the foundations for the establishment of enhanced partnerships with States with needs under the CCM which would facilitate timely and effective implementation of obligations, including Country Coalitions; and

(e) To provide an opportunity for the Coordinators to hear directly from States Parties how to improve their support to States Parties.

78. In these meetings, the key points raised by States with potential needs under the CCM included that:

(a) States requiring assistance should be more assertive in pursuing assistance at an early stage;

(b) Affected States should be more active in pursuing regional cooperation as a mechanism to meet CCM obligations;

(c) States requiring assistance should have a detailed completion plan in place and provide specific details in assistance requests regarding the nature of assistance required and the extent of existing national investment in completion efforts;

(d) States requiring assistance need to keep sensitizing donors/partners to their needs to combat loss of institutional memory;

(e) The ISU or the Coordinators could establish a database facilitating not only the sharing of information on donor/partner priorities and capacities to assist, but also the sharing of needs and experience between affected States;

(f) Donors/partners should coordinate closely with national mine action authorities to understand the real needs and priorities for assistance. Donor States should remain sensitive to each affected States' needs. They should not apply a template approach;

(g) Donors/partners should consider long-term/multi-year partnerships with States requiring assistance;

(h) The Country Coalition approach offers an effective framework for ensuring national ownership and long-term commitments by donors/partners;

(i) Article 7 reports are a key channel for communication: affected States and others with pressing obligations should use these reports to provide full details of needs, and donor/partner States should use them to provide full details of assistance capacities and priorities.

79. The key points raised by States with the capacity to provide assistance to meet such needs included that:

(a) In decision-making and reporting on assistance, donors tended to focus more on the socio-economic benefit of mine action than on the specific munition being cleared;

(b) Affected countries should highlight potential development benefits of assistance being sought;

(c) Donors faced internal challenges coordinating and breaking down silos between ministries, as well as highlighting the broader development benefits of mine action;

(d) Donors faced ongoing coordination challenges both at the international level and on the ground, with other donors and local authorities;

(e) It was important for donors to identify the right local authorities to partner with when providing assistance;

(f) Multi-year funding arrangements were not possible for some countries, but could be replicated through consistent funding to particular projects;

(g) There were a number of countries with impending deadlines under the Convention, which had small obstacles to overcome to achieve completion of their obligations and which could be targeted for assistance;

(h) A database could be a useful mechanism for sharing information on needs, capacities for assistance and experience in meeting challenges, and could also help track assistance provided and progress on deadlines;

(i) On the other hand, attempts to set up such databases for other Conventions had been unsuccessful because of the burden on the ISU, Coordinators and States Parties of maintaining them. States Parties might be better advised to focus on enhancing sharing of information through the existing Article 7 reporting process;

(j) Affected countries had an important role to play in sharing experiences of meeting completion challenges.

80. The third closed informal meeting also featured presentations by two States Parties, Lebanon and Botswana, currently engaged in partnerships to address obligations under the CCM. These partnerships were highlighted as excellent examples of the sort of cooperation envisaged under the Country Coalition concept. Participants agreed it would be useful to showcase such partnerships at Meetings of States Parties.

81. The closed informal meetings convened by the Coordinators proved an effective platform, both because they enabled the valuable exchanges on these points, but also because they clearly continued to support new partnerships. The Coordinators recommend continuation of the practice of holding such meetings, and showcasing at future MSPs the progress made in partnerships supported by these meetings.

F. Transparency Measures

Table 6

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik action plan actions 6.1 to 6.2	*During reporting period*
An increase in the rate of submissions of transparency reports provided under Article 7 Improved quality in reporting Increased exchange of information of good and cost effective reporting practices Increased use of the reporting guide that reflects the actual need for qualitative information and represents a useful tool for States Parties to submit initial reports and annual updates	Report in time, initially and annually	Two States Parties missed their initial report deadlines Nine States Parties submitted their overdue initial transparency reports 58 States Parties submitted their 2017 annual reports while 25 were still outstanding 13 States Parties have overdue initial reports to submit
	Make practical use of reporting	12 out of 58 States requested for cooperation and assistance through their transparency report

1. Questions/challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

(a) What are the factors that facilitate enhanced submission rates of both initial and annual transparency reports?

(b) What best practices on reporting could be shared to enhance quality of reports and increase submission rate?

2. Progress report on Transparency Measures: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

82. All States Parties to the CCM are required to report, initially, within 180 days of entry into force of the CCM for the State Party, and then annually with updates by 30 April.

83. According to the information available on the UNODA Article 7 database on 30 June 2018, a total of 89 Initial Transparency Reports due from 102 States Parties had been submitted as required by Article 7 of the Convention, representing 88% of States Parties for which the obligation applied at that time.

84. In the period under review, nine States Parties (Belize, Bolivia, Cooks Islands, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Nauru, Palau, South Africa and the State of Palestine) submitted their overdue Initial Transparency Report. Two States Parties (Madagascar and Benin) missed the 30 April 2018 and 30 June 2018 due dates respectively for the submission of their initial transparency reports.

85. As at 30 June 2018, 13 States Parties still had overdue Initial Article 7 Transparency Report (Benin, Cape Verde, Comoros, Congo, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Madagascar, Rwanda, Somalia, Togo and Tunisia).

86. During the review period, the number of overdue Initial Article 7 Transparency Reports decreased by approximately 60%.

87. As at 30 June 2018, 58 States Parties had submitted their 2017 Annual Report, leaving 25 States Parties with overdue 2017 annual transparency reports. Therefore, out of 102 States Parties that should have submitted an initial or annual Article 7 transparency report by 30 April 2018, 38 still needed to submit either an initial or annual report.

88. For new State Party, Sri Lanka, the Convention will enter into force on 1st September 2018 therefore its deadline for the submission of its Initial Transparency Report is 28 February 2019; 180 days after the into force of the Convention for it.

89. During the period under review, in support of the work done by the thematic Coordinator, Zambia, the Implementation Support Unit held several bilateral meetings with States Parties with overdue initial and annual reports to better understand the challenges faced by the states and to assist them complete the reports. In reaching out to and having exchanges with 37 out of the 40 States Parties with outstanding initial or 2016 Article 7 reports; the ISU provided direct support to eight States with their initial transparency reporting and to fifteen States Parties with their annual reporting which resulted in a significant increase in the reporting rate by the end of 2017. Additionally, between January and June 2018, the ISU continued to follow up with States Parties on outstanding reports at various CCM related events. This targeted approach resulted in the submission 9 out of the 20 initial reports which had been outstanding at the end of the last reporting period.

90. During the First Committee meetings of the 72nd General Assembly of the United Nations, at the lunchtime event co-hosted by Zambia Coordinator on Transparency Measures and New Zealand Coordinator on National Implementation Measures, the ISU gave a presentation on Article 7 obligations and its importance. The ISU provided several such presentations during the reporting period at various events.

G. National Implementation Measures

Table 7

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik action plan actions 7.1 to 7.3	*During reporting period*
All States parties being in compliance with Article 9 and have reported on national implementation in formal meetings of the Convention and through Article 7 transparency reports		Five States Parties reported that their national legislation is sufficient
		One State informed that CCM regulations were pending approval
All relevant national actors, including armed forces being informed of obligations under the Convention and of national implementation measures including as a result of their reflection, where necessary in military doctrine, policies and training	Enact national legislation to implement the CCM	Eight Sates Parties informed that they were still in the process of developing legislation
		10 States Parties have legislation that prohibits investments in cluster munitions
	Highlight challenges and request assistance	One State requested assistance for Article 9 implementation
		The February 2018 Conference in Auckland, New Zealand provided a forum for Pacific Island countries

2nd Review Conference Goals	*Actions to be taken*	*Progress made*
	Dubrovnik action plan actions 7.1 to 7.3	*During reporting period*
	Raise awareness of national implementation measures	to share challenges NIM included in a reporting workshop in New York in October 2017 Promotion of model legislation at February 2018 Conference in Auckland, New Zealand Bilateral and regional outreach

1. Questions/Challenges for discussion at the Eighth Meeting of States Parties

(a) What would encourage those States Parties that have yet to do so to review their national legislation and report on it?

(b) How can uptake of existing implementation tools, including model legislation, be improved?

(c) How can we encourage States Parties and Signatory States to identify specific assistance that may be needed to implement the CCM?

(d) Beyond the introduction of national legislation, in what ways can States Parties address the issue of investment in cluster munitions?

(e) How can States Parties be further encouraged to share best practices with respect to the dissemination to relevant national stakeholders of national obligations under the CCM?

2. Progress report on National Implementation Measures: monitoring progress in the implementation of the Dubrovnik Action Plan

91. Over the course of the period under review, work on National Implementation Measures strived to make progress towards the achievement of the two relevant goals agreed in the Dubrovnik Action Plan, namely: "all States Parties being in compliance with Article 9 and have reported on national implementation in formal meetings of the Convention and through Article 7 transparency reports; and all relevant national actors, including armed forces being informed of obligations under the Convention and of National Implementation Measures including as a result of their reflection, where necessary in military doctrine, policies and training."

92. In the absence of inter-sessional meetings, States Parties have been encouraged to submit written updates on their National Implementation Measures, particularly through the timely submission of Article 7 transparency reports. The Coordinator for National Implementation Measures, New Zealand, with the support of the Implementation Support Unit and the Co-ordinator for Transparency Measures, Zambia, hosted a workshop in New York in the margins of the United Nations General Assembly First Committee and highlighted the importance of States Parties including information on implementing legislation in their initial and annual reports.

93. Issues relating to National Implementation Measures, including challenges as well as the availability of tools to assist States Parties, were also highlighted at the Pacific Conference on Conventional Weapons Treaties. This Conference, which was held in Auckland, New Zealand, from 12 to 14 February 2018, was sponsored by Australia and New Zealand and was attended by 12 Pacific States including seven States Parties to the CCM. The Coordinator for National Implementation Measures is continuing its outreach to

Pacific Island States on issues raised at the Conference by carrying out dedicated bilateral visits. To date this has comprised visits to Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

94. In addition, a number of States Parties have reported on National Implementation Measures in their Article 7 initial and/or annual reports:

95. Five States Parties (Albania, Bolivia, Mozambique, Palau and State of Palestine) reported that their national legislation sufficiently includes items recommended by Article 9, thereby contributing to the increase in the number of States Parties that have reported to have sufficient law in place.

96. One State Party (Cook Islands) reported having specific law in place to implement the CCM.

97. One State Party (State of Palestine) also informed that it is currently studying a model of national law on CCM for affected States Parties, including the criminalisation of activities prohibited under the Convention.

98. Seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Belize, Botswana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi, Swaziland and Zambia) reported that work on legislation to implement the CCM is ongoing.

99. One State Party (Nauru) requested assistance for Article 9 implementation through its initial transparency report.

100. Since entry into force of the Convention in August 2010, 10 States Parties (Belgium, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Samoa, Spain and Switzerland) have reported the enactment of national legislation prohibiting investments in producers of cluster munitions or forms of investment in cluster munitions.